

Then, as now, the President had no plan and no strategy about how America can stabilize Iraq, bring our soldiers home with dignity and honor, and accomplish the mission. Then, as now, we are muddling through day by day, hoping for the best, fearing the worst.

Iraq was the big mistake. There was no urgent need to go to war in Iraq. Saddam Hussein was a brutal dictator. But he did not pose the kind of immediate threat to our national security that could justify a unilateral, preventive war without the broad support of the international community.

It is clear that the Bush administration manipulated, misrepresented, and distorted the available intelligence in order to justify the war in Iraq. They put a spin on the intelligence and a spin on the truth. They said Saddam was acquiring nuclear weapons. He wasn't. They said he had close ties to al-Qaida. He didn't. Congress would never have voted to authorize the war if we had known the truth.

Our military had a brilliant plan to win the war. Our soldiers performed brilliantly during the 3-week initial military operation. But the President had no plan to win the peace. He said we would be treated as liberators, and in the first day or two after the statue of Saddam fell, we were. But then the massive looting began. Resentment by the Iraqi people began, and the liberation quickly turned into an occupation.

Iraq has become a quagmire. It may well go down as the worst blunder in the entire history of American foreign policy.

Iraq is George Bush's Vietnam. By going to war in Iraq, President Bush squandered the immense good will of the world community we had won in the wake of 9/11, and we are paying a high price in the lives of our troops and the respect of other nations.

By going to war in Iraq, President Bush has made the real war on terrorism harder to win. We left the war in Afghanistan unfinished. We should never have given al-Qaida precious time to recover and regroup and expand their reach. By doing so, we made future terrorist attacks on the United States more likely.

Before the war, Pentagon officials assured Congress that firm plans were in place to secure Iraq and rebuild it. The reality is that the administration had a plan on paper, but not a real plan—and precious little paper at that.

The administration's post-war planning was based on a quicksand of false assumptions. It has been hamstrung by blunder, after blunder, after blunder. The continuing arrogance of the administration has blinded it to the cold, hard facts about the immense challenge of post-war reconstruction in Iraq.

Based on our experience in Bosnia, in Kosovo, in East Timor, and in Afghanistan, we knew security could be a profound problem, with major challenges from a restless population. Yet we had no broad security plan, as the early

looting quickly showed, and a dangerous security situation still exists today.

The administration assumed that we would be able to draw on thousands of Saddam's police force to protect security—but in the critical early weeks that followed the war, they were nowhere to be found, and too many of their officers turned out to be thugs and torturers.

The administration assumed that Iraqi exile leaders could return to Iraq to rally the population and lead the new government, but they were—and still are—strongly resented by the Iraqi people.

Today, with the transfer of sovereignty scheduled for the end of June, the administration still has no idea about who should run the country. They assumed that after a few hundred of Saddam's top advisers were removed from power, large numbers of local officials would remain to run the government—but the government crumbled. Today, it remains in shambles.

Wrongly, we continue to rely primarily on a military solution for politically inspired violence. Look at Fallujah. Let us hope we don't have to hear Secretary Rumsfeld say, "We had to destroy Fallujah in order to save it."

It is painfully clear that the President and those who advocated the war have lost all credibility on Iraq. They did not understand the situation going into the war. They do not understand the situation now. And they have no plan to extricate us from the quagmire they created. The result has been chaos for the Iraqi people, and continuing mortal danger for our troops.

We cannot cut and run. Our soldiers deserve a genuine strategy to deal with the continuing crisis.

All of us who have concerns about the administration's past policy welcome the reinvolved of the United Nations in Iraq and the administration's openness to a new U.N. resolution. The question is whether the administration's efforts will provide any significant relief for our troops.

There is no sign of that yet. The Bush administration has poked its finger in the eye of almost every other nation in the world, and they have little incentive or interest in coming to our rescue.

Our military has been bearing a disproportionate share of the burden. We have 80 percent of the troops on the ground, and we have suffered 80 percent of the casualties. That burden is increasing, with Spain, Honduras, Nicaragua, and El Salvador pulling troops out of the country, and others threatening to do the same.

Very little will change after the transfer of sovereignty and under the administration's plan to work with the international community. It is not even a genuine transfer of sovereignty. We'll still be running the show in Iraq. A U.S. occupation by another name is still a U.S. occupation.

We need a real change in our foreign policy, not a cosmetic change. Only a new administration that has the trust and confidence of the rest of the world will be able to bring in the international community to provide international police, provide international financial resources, achieve a workable political solution, and, relieve the burden on our military and bring them home with dignity and honor.

Mr. President, our mission in Iraq is far from accomplished. Our men and women in uniform know it. The Iraqi people know it. And the American people know it too.

I withhold the remainder of my time. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who yields time?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

MISSION NOT ACCOMPLISHED

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, a year ago the President of the United States harkened back to his days as an aviator for the Texas Air National Guard to deliver a dramatic made-for-television speech. Eager to experience the thrill of a carrier landing, the President donned a flight suit, strapped into a jet, and rocketed off into the wild blue yonder for a 30-mile journey.

This flight of fancy concluded with the dramatic landing of that speeding plane onto the deck of an aircraft carrier, the USS *Abraham Lincoln*—so named for the stoic leader who guided our country through one of its most troubled times.

Such was the scene on May 1, 2003, under the warming rays of the California sun. The President delivered to the sailors on that ship a welcome and long overdue message: He commended the men and women on their outstanding service to our country during the trials of the war in Iraq, and welcomed them back to the United States of America.

While the President delivered those words of appreciation, every television viewer in the country—and, indeed, the world—could see in the background a banner with the words "Mission Accomplished"—"Mission Accomplished"—superimposed upon the Stars and Stripes.

In contrast to the simple humility of President Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, President Bush's speech was designed from the outset to be remembered right up until November 2, 2004.

The President announced unequivocally that "major combat operations in Iraq have ended," and that "in the battle of Iraq, the United States and our allies have prevailed." Now, 1 year later, combat deaths are more than five times that of a year ago when our President celebrated "mission accomplished."

Since that time, Iraq has become a veritable shooting gallery. This April

has been the bloodiest month of the entire war, with more than 120 Americans killed. Young lives cut short in pointless conflict, and all the President can say is that it "has been a tough couple of weeks"—a tough couple of weeks, indeed.

Plans have obviously gone tragically awry. But the President has, so far, only managed to mutter that we must "stay the course." But what course is there to keep when our ship of state is being tossed like a dinghy in a storm of Middle East politics? If the course is to end in the liberation of Iraq and bring a definitive end to the war against Saddam Hussein, one must conclude, mission not accomplished, Mr. President.

The White House argues time and again that Iraq is the "central front" on the war on terrorism. But instead of keeping murderous al-Qaida terrorists on the run, the invasion of Iraq has stoked the fires of terrorism against the United States and our allies. Najaf is smoldering. Fallujah is burning. And there is no exit in sight. What has been accomplished, Mr. President?

Al-Qaida has morphed into a hydra-headed beast, no longer dependent on Osama bin Laden. The administration has flippantly claimed that it is better to tie down terrorists in Iraq than to battle them in our homeland. Mr. President, with hundreds of thousands of American troops in Iraq for the foreseeable future, and a worldwide campaign of terrorism gathering steam, who is tying down whom?

Indeed, our attack on Iraq has given Islamic militants a common cause and has fertilized the field for new recruits. The failures by the United States to secure the peace in Iraq has virtually guaranteed al-Qaida a fertile field of new recruits ready to sacrifice their lives to fight the American infidels. These extremists openly call for "jihad," swear allegiance to bin Laden, and refer to the September 11 murderers as the "magnificent 19." According to intelligence sources, hundreds of young Muslims are answering recruitment calls with a resounding "yes."

Amidst all this, the American people are asking themselves one central question: Have we been made more safe by the President's war in Iraq? Do we sleep more soundly in our beds now that Saddam Hussein has been captured? Or, instead, are we starting to fully comprehend and regret the fury which has been unleashed by the unprovoked attack on Iraq?

Deaths and casualties of Iraqi citizens are in the thousands—their blood is on our hands—but an actual number cannot be obtained. Is it any wonder that Iraqis see us, not as liberators, but as crusaders and conquerors? A growing number of Iraqis see us as we would see foreign troops on the streets of Chicago or New York or Washington, or any small town in America. Surely one can understand the hatred brewing in Iraq in the hearts of the men and women and children—the boys and girls—in Iraq when we see the agony—

the agony—of an Iraqi family that has lost a loved one due to an errant bomb or bullet.

One year after President Bush proclaimed the conclusion of major combat operations in Iraq, is the world any safer from terrorism? Iraq has become a breeding ground for terrorists of all stripes. The Middle East seethes in deepening violence and the culture of revenge. Our war on terror appears to many as a war against Islam. A one-sided policy on the Arab-Israeli conflict drives both sides away from the peace table, and hundreds of millions more to hatred of our country. No, the world is not safer.

One year after the "mission accomplished" speech, is America safer? We have not secured our homeland from terrifying threats of destruction. This President has sown divisions in our longstanding alliances. He has squandered our treasure in Iraq and put us deep in debt. Our brave soldiers are pinned down in Iraq while our enemies see the invincible American armor as penetrable by the sword of urban guerrilla warfare. No, America is not safer.

One year ago, the President announced an end to major combat operations in Iraq. And yet our troops are having their deployments extended in Iraq while our lines are stretched thin everywhere else. Billions upon billions of taxpayer dollars are being poured into Iraq. Seven hundred and twenty-two American lives have been lost before today. And we hear that 8 to 10 additional lives have been lost today. Unknown thousands of Iraqis are dead. Claims of WMD and death-dealing drones are discredited. And bin Laden is still on the loose.

I stand behind no one in supporting our troops through the dangers they face every day. I grieve along with the families that have lost loved ones. The failures of post-war Iraq lay squarely on the Bush administration for recklessly sending this country—sending our men and women—to war, a war that should not have been fought, a war in the wrong place, at the wrong time, and for the wrong reasons.

Mission accomplished? The mission in Iraq, as laid out by President Bush and Vice President CHENEY, has failed. Even more disturbing, the disdain for international law, and the military bombast of this cocky, reckless administration have tarnished the beacon of hope and freedom which the United States of America once offered to the world.

How long will America continue to pay the price in blood and treasure of this President's war? How long must the best of our Nation's military men and women be taken from their homes to fight this unnecessary war in Iraq? How long must our National Guardsmen be taken from their communities to fight and to die in the hot sands of Iraq? How long must the mothers and the fathers see their sons and daughters die in a faraway land because of President Bush's doctrine of preemp-

tive attack? How long must little children across our great land go to sleep at night crying for a daddy or a mother far away who may never come back home?

President Bush typified the Happy Warrior when he strutted across the deck of the USS *Abraham Lincoln* a year ago this coming Saturday. He was in his glory that day. But on this May 1, we will remember the widows and the orphans who have been made by his fateful decision to attack Iraq. We will be aware of the tears that have been shed for his glory. How long? How long? How long?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MURKOWSKI). The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, I yield my remaining time to the Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, in the midst of the ongoing upsurge of the violence in Iraq, President Bush has offered two options for the United States. The first option is to stay the course; the second option is to cut and run. That is a false choice between staying the course and cutting and running. It is too typical of the black and white approach that this administration has repeatedly and unwisely taken.

For example, saying "you are either with us or against us" is a black and white choice—the stark choice the President laid down to allies. Well, it may make you feel good to say that, but it needlessly offends those who are certainly not hostile to the United States but may be unwilling to affirmatively endorse all of our actions.

In addition to the President's stark two options—staying the course or cutting and running—there is a third way, and that is to correct the course we are on. The administration has belatedly begun this process, but there is much to be done, and it is much harder and more difficult because of the administration's stubborn insistence that no mistakes were made and its refusal to learn the lessons that need to be learned from those mistakes.

For instance, after holding the United Nations at arm's length, the administration is now belatedly working with the U.N., asking them to help identify an entity to whom sovereignty could be restored by June 30—an entity which needs to have the confidence and credibility of the Iraqi people. I hope this will be the start of a true partnership at the U.N. in fostering Iraq's political and economic development.

The administration has decided to retain some troops in Iraq that were scheduled to leave, despite the fact that the administration disparaged General Shinseki when he foretold the need for more troops for the stability phase.

The administration decided to modify its policy on de-Baathification and reinstate about 11,000 teachers and

hundreds of professors and is reportedly looking to reinstate others whose skills and support are needed for Iraq's development. I hope this revision is seen for what it is—acknowledgement that we went too far, acknowledgement that we made a mistake. I hope it will also include the removal of Ahmed Chalabi as the head of the de-Baathification program, as well. He is the wrong person for the job for a lot of reasons.

While not reversing the mistaken decision to disband the Iraqi Army, the administration's decision to bring back some military officers who were not high Baathists to help guide the new Iraqi Army and other security forces is a practical first step—very late. We only have a few thousand in the Iraqi Army who are now trained but long overdue.

One other mistake was perhaps the biggest mistake of all, in my judgment. Our uniformed military leadership was largely excluded from the planning for the potentially violent aftermath of the fall of Saddam Hussein's regime. The civilians in the Pentagon who were put in charge projected rose-colored scenarios in their planning for the aftermath: Our troops would be greeted with embraces and flowers. It would be a cakewalk.

Had our uniformed military leadership been more deeply involved in that planning, it would have been very different, as our military plans for worst case scenarios. The worst case scenario is what turned out to be the case. But uniformed military were all but left out of the planning for the post-Saddam period. General Tommy Franks, the now retired commander of Central Command who planned the other phases of the operation, confirmed that to me and to Senator WARNER a few weeks ago.

On the matter of planning, I realize the administration is committed to the June 30 date for the restoration of Iraqi sovereignty. But I hope that commitment will not prevent it from planning for other options in the event Mr. Brahimi is not successful in identifying a credible entity to whom sovereignty can be restored by that date.

If we have a chance of succeeding and bringing stability and democracy to Iraq, it will mean learning from our mistakes, not denying them and not ignoring them.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. Madam President, are we now under the Republican time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I yield that 3 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. DAYTON.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 3050

Mr. DAYTON. Madam President, I thank my friend from Nevada for this opportunity to speak on behalf of the amendment being offered by Senator DASCHLE to the bill before the Senate about the use of ethanol and other renewable fuels.

Here we are in the middle of this energy price crisis in our country, when in Minnesota the price of a gallon of regular unleaded gasoline is almost \$2, and in other parts of the country it is as high as \$2.50. Possibly it is going higher. I am being asked what are we doing about bringing the price of motor fuel down. I think the honest answer is nothing. There is not a whole lot we can do when we are dependent upon foreign supplies of oil, when we are sending \$115 billion a year overseas to buy that product.

Senator DASCHLE's amendment—I give him great credit for every year championing the cause of renewable fuels, with the opportunity that is right before us in America today to shift from foreign oil consumption to using a cleaner burning, lower priced, American-grown, American-produced fuel, not as a substitute for MTBE—the additives to gasoline—but as a substitute for gasoline itself. I know that because I drive all over the State of Minnesota in a Ford Explorer, factory-produced, with a slight modification to the usual engine. It was modified in the factory. I drive on 85-percent ethanol and 15-percent gasoline. Today it is 20 cents a gallon cheaper than regular unleaded gasoline. I can get it in most places in Minnesota.

We can give the American people a choice to have a homegrown fuel with the money staying in America to benefit our rural economies. We can renew it every year. We know we can produce the amount that will be necessary, and today it will cost 20 to 15 cents a gallon less than regular unleaded gasoline and likely in the future \$1 less than the rising cost of gasoline. If we are not going to take any steps to bring about that opportunity, people will think we are out of our minds.

I do not understand why the debate today on Senator DASCHLE's amendment about why do this, or why not do this and even more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. DAYTON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent for 1 minute to finish my remarks.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask that the majority have an additional 1 minute in morning business also.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DAYTON. Madam President, Senator DASCHLE has been heroic in my caucus and this body in his support for those who are not in corn-producing States who support ethanol and other renewable fuels, biofuels as products. But this is not just about South Dakota or Minnesota. Yes, it benefits my State. It benefits the farmers of my

State. This benefits America. This is the best opportunity in my lifetime to shift our energy consumption from our traditional sources and their costs to something that is American, that is clean, and that is cheaper. I am amazed we are not racing to the stores for that product. We have it. Senator DASCHLE's amendment will take us in that direction. We should be doing even more than that, but this is an important first step. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

IRAQ

Mr. THOMAS. Madam President, I had come to the Senate floor to talk about an issue that is very important to all of us, particularly Medicare recipients in this country. But first I have to express some disappointment, frankly, and some surprise about the discussion that has gone on here in the first 30 minutes criticizing the President on everything that is happening overseas, acting as if we are not in support of what is happening there.

I am very surprised and, frankly, disappointed. All they talk about is what the President has done. We voted here on this floor to do this job in the Middle East. That is what we are seeking to do, and that is what our great service people are doing for us over there.

The idea behind conducting Operation Iraqi Freedom was to free 25 million Iraqis from the Saddam Hussein regime. That is why we are there: to defend the will of the international community, to remove the threat of terrorism that happened here on September 11, and to change the dynamics in the Middle East. That is what we are seeking to do, and that is what we are trying to carry on, and it is an admirable effort.

Madam President, 211 Members of Congress have visited Iraq and witnessed firsthand some of the extraordinary efforts of the coalition forces and Iraqis. I have been to Iraq. I am impressed with what they are doing. For us to simply criticize everything that is happening there aimed at the election in 2004 is a great disappointment to me.

Despite the terrorist attacks and the tough events that have happened, public opinion has found 56 percent of Iraqis believe things are better than they were; 71 percent believe a year from now they will be better than they are now. Again, having been there, I agree with that assessment. I have been there traveling around with the military, with all the little kids waving and saying hello. I have seen the schools and hospitals that have been fixed up. Of course, there is a real problem with terrorism, there is no question about it.

The defeat of Saddam Hussein's regime is the second major victory in the war on terrorism. We need to continue.